DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 668 HE 016 605

AUTHOR Pile, Wilson, Ed.
TITLE Massachusetts Higher Education in the Eighties: The Long Range Plan for Public Higher Education. A White Paper. The Alden Seminars.
INSTITUTION Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts.; Massachusetts Univ., Boston. Center for Studies in Policy and Public Interest.
SPONS AGENCY Alden (George I.) Trust, Worcester, MA.; National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 18 Nov 82
NOTE 39p.; This paper resulted from the first of four Alden Seminars scheduled for 1982-83 (Boston, MA, November 18, 1982). Support also provided by the Gillette Corp.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; *College Planning; *Governance; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; *Long Range Planning; Position Papers; Program Evaluation; Public Education; *State Boards of Education; *State Colleges; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

Statewide planning for higher education, with specific reference to Massachusetts, is discussed in a 1982 Alden Seminar position paper, comments regarding the position paper, and an overview of the overall seminar. In "One Half Revolution, One Half Status Quo: Remarks on A Long Range Plan for Public Higher Education in Massachusetts," Stephen Joel Trachtenberg discusses the Massachusetts "Long Range Plan" for higher education. This plan requires faculties and administrators to share the responsibility for academic planning not only with their own boards of trustees but with the statewide board of regents. In addition to reviewing annually the enrollments of the 27 taxpayer-supported institutions, the board of regents will undertake periodic systemwide reviews of selected academic fields or program areas, along with comprehensive institutional program reviews on a 5-year cycle. Personal perspectives are offered regarding whether this new system for Massachusetts higher education will succeed, and predictable stresses and strains that will occur as the new system goes into full operation are identified. In addition, the question of whether the plan is adequate in meeting the challenges posed by the current period is addressed. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Alden Seminars

ED233668

A White Paper

Massachusetts Higher Education in the Eighties:

The Long Range Plan for Public Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Board of Boston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NE016 Cost

ALDEN SEMINARS

Sponsored by
Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities of Massachusetts
and
The University of Massachusetts-Boston.

Independent and public higher education constitutes a major resource of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and has a very significant total economic impact on this state. Industry is strengthened by this resource and the attributes of its higher education system help make Massachusetts an attractive place to live and work. Higher education has entered a dangerous decade characterized by inflation and escalating costs, declining resources, a precipitous decline in the traditional college age population, and the absence of rational planning in the public sector.

In recognition of these formidable problems the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts and the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest at the University of Massachusetts at Boston saw the need for an on-going forum in which influential leaders from business, industry, and higher education, both private and public, might strive to create broad public and governmental awareness of these matters.

To establish such a forum application was made to the George I. Alden Trust for financial support to organize a series of seminars to be held during 1981-82, in which a group of twenty educational, business, and industrial leaders would meet together to discuss substantial position papers dealing with major issues in higher education and to identify possible solutions for problems and areas for action. After each seminar the goal was to publish a "white paper" which would make a contribution to a better informed public and which could be useful to those entrusted with policy formation. The Alden Trust awarded the grant requested, and Alden Seminars held scheduled sessions in November, January, and April, and a special session was held in March of academic year 1981-82. Outreach from these sessions was greatly strengthened by a Ford Foundation grant awarded the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest which permitted the publication and dissemination of the 1981-82 Alden Seminar White Papers. Four Seminar sessions are scheduled for 1982-83. The first, which this White Paper represents, was held at the University of Massachusetts at Boston on November 18, 1982.

Representing the Steering Committee of the Alden Seminars, we would like to take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation to the George I. Alden Trust for its continued generous support, the National Endowment for the Humanities for awarding the Seminar a significant

Coordinator
Dorothy N. Marshall
Commonwealth Professor Emeritus
Healey Library
University of Massachusetts
Harbor Campus
Boston, MA 02125

Director's Grant, and the Gillette Corporation for a most helpful contribution toward making this program possible. Recognition is also due Wilson Pile, Staff Associate at the Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest and Editor of the White Papers, and the good efforts of Mrs. Sylvia Bengen and Mrs. Patience Moll in making the Seminars work as smoothly and as expeditiously as they do. Thus far the Alden Seminars reflect both accomplishment and promise — to all involved, far too many to continue enumerating, we express our thanks.

Dorothy N. Marshall
Coordinator Alden Seminars

Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Association of Independent Colleges
and Universities of Massachusetts

Franklin Patterson
Boyden Professor of the University
University of Massachusetts

Table of Contents

I. Roster of Participants..... 1

II. Overview and Outcomes..... 3

III. Position Paper by Stephen J. Trachtenberg.... 5

IV. Comments by T. Edward Hollander.....23

V. Comments by John B. Duff.....24

VI. Brief Biographies of the Participants.....28

PARTICIPANTS

James T. Amsler	President Salem State College
Mortimer H. Appley	President Clark University
John E. Brooks	President The College of the Holy Cross
John W. Chandler	President Williams College
Robert A. Corrigan	Chancellor University of Massachusetts at Boston
Robert Cushman	Chairman of the Board The Norton Company
John Fox	Chairman of the Board SCA Services, Inc.
Carl Gilbert	President Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts
Avram J. Goldberg	President and Chief Executive Officer The Stop and Shop Companies
George W. Hazzard	Former member Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education
Joseph P. Healey	Chairman of the Board Refrigerated Food Express, Inc.
Jacob Hiatt	President Rand-Whitney Corporation
Elizabeth Kennan	President Mount Holyoke College
David C. Knapp	President University of Massachusetts
Roderick M. MacDougall	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer Bank of New England

Dorothy Marshall	Coordinator Alden Seminars
Harold T. Miller	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer Houghton-Mifflin Company
Coleman M. Mockler, Jr.	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer The Gillette Company
Guy W. Nichols	Chairman, President, Chief Executive Officer New England Electric System
Franklin K. Patterson	Director, Center for Policy Studies University of Massachusetts at Boston
David B. Perini	Chairman, President, Chief Executive Officer Perini Corporation
Edward E. Phillips	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer The New England Mutual Life Insurance Company
Kenneth G. Ryder	President Northeastern University
Harold E. Shively	President Bunker Hill Community College
Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr.	Executive Vice President Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts

Overview and Outcomes

On Thursday, November 18, 1982, the members of the Alden Seminar met for the afternoon at the University of Massachusetts at Boston. Their purpose, in this first of four scheduled sessions during this academic year, was to examine current statewide planning for higher education, with particular reference to Massachusetts. Regular Alden Seminar participants include chief executives of important business and industrial concerns in the Commonwealth as well as chief executives from a number of private and public colleges and universities.

At the beginning of the afternoon Seminar members heard introductory comments from Dr. Dorothy N. Marshall, Coordinator for the Seminars, who then proceeded to introduce the special guests for the session: Dr. John B. Duff, Chancellor of the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education; Dr. T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education; and Massachusetts State Senator John W. Olver, Chairman of the Taxation Committee and Vice Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Dr. Stephen J. Trachtenberg, President of the University of Hartford, then briefly reviewed highlights of the position paper he had prepared for the Seminar, which is presented as part of this White Paper addressing the proposed Long Range Plan of the Board of Regents. Following these remarks, Chancellor Hollander commented on the Trachtenberg position paper from the viewpoint of his experience in New Jersey, New York, and elsewhere. A portion of Chancellor Hollander's statement is included in this White Paper. Dr. Duff then addressed the position paper, and his remarks are presented as part of this White Paper. The Trachtenberg position paper and the issues it addressed were then discussed by the Seminar for the balance of the session.

The Coordinator noted that several representatives of the media in the Boston area had expressed their desire to attend Seminar sessions, but had been refused admission on the basis of policy set last year. She requested the sense of the Seminar for 1982-83. Consensus was immediate and unanimous that a particular strength of the Seminars was its characteristic free and open debate and that media presence could diminish this characteristic and result in less substantial give-and-take. It was determined to keep the Seminars limited to the membership and invited participant guests.

The presence of Senator Olver was appreciated, as were his substantial contributions to the deliberations. The Seminar concluded that the presence of legislative leadership had shown itself to be very beneficial to the dialogue and should be continued. The Steering Committee was directed to try to insure legislative leadership presence at the upcoming sessions.

The contributions of Dr. Hollander provided a useful set of interstate policy comparisons. Although higher education has less of a presence in New Jersey than in Massachusetts, he said, state government commitment to higher education, both public and private, is proportionately greater in New Jersey. The state in which he is presently Chancellor has developed two noteworthy formulas: New Jersey provides twenty-five cents per state resident attending a private sector institution for each dollar spent on public sector institutions, and tuition at the public colleges and universities is pegged at thirty percent of cost. Chancellor Hollander noted that all institutions are tax-supported one way or another -- at issue is degree and kind of support. What each state needs is a strategic plan to determine who gets educated at which institution at what cost to the public and at what cost to private interests.

Chancellor Duff made a major contribution to the Seminar through his detailed reaction to the Trachtenberg position paper. He provided the members of the Seminar with a sense of the background and thought which resulted in the Regents' proposed long-range plan. Through his comprehensive definition of the framework in which the Regents and their staff are operating, the Seminar was able to gain a clearer understanding of the issues and obstacles confronting the planning process for higher education in the Commonwealth.

Dr. Trachtenberg's remarks were brief and cogent. He made note of the similarities between Massachusetts and other states, emphasizing that although the Regent's Master Plan is directed at the Commonwealth, the issues addressed by the Plan and by his paper affect higher education across the nation. In addition he noted that since he wrote the first draft of his paper he had received additional encouraging information, but remained concerned over whether higher education was capable of solving its own problems -- that the most problematic element -- financing, was, in the main, beyond its control.

Ensuing discussion centered around further exploration and definition of the issues involved. Accountability and control, responsibility and responsiveness, independence and dependence, the nuances inherent in the concept of quality . . . all combined to keep the Seminar well engaged for the balance of the afternoon. At 4:30 P.M. the Alden Seminar adjourned until its next scheduled session on Thursday, January 20, 1983, at the University of Massachusetts at Boston.

ONE HALF REVOLUTION, ONE HALF STATUS QUO

Remarks on A Long Range Plan for Public Higher Education in Massachusetts

(Phase 1)

Delivered to the Alden Seminars in Higher Education
on Thursday, November 18, 1982
by Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, President,
University of Hartford

INTRODUCTION

Having spent many years as a teacher and administrator at Boston University, and having kept in close touch with my Massachusetts friends and colleagues since the time that I emigrated to the University of Hartford in 1977, I am very pleased to have been asked to make some comments on an unusually ambitious and significant project: a long range plan which seeks to rationalize and stabilize nothing less than all of taxpayer-supported higher education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The ambitiousness of the plan is obvious, but its nation-wide significance should not be underestimated. One of the recurring phrases in the Plan is "scarce resources." This is another way of saying that the drive to rationalize and stabilize derives its urgency from the times in which we live and from conditions that affect taxpayer-supported and independent colleges and universities in each of the 50 states of the Union.

From 1950 to 1970, American higher education enjoyed what may seem to be, in retrospect, its halcyon years. From 1970 to 1980, and especially from the time of the "oil shock" of 1973, the responses of American educators to changing fiscal circumstance had a definite short-term flavor.

Reaction rather than action was the order of the day as we sought to cope with the unprecedented and sometimes devastating "inputs" of inflation and of America's new demographic patterns.

Seen from that perspective, the creation of the Massachusetts Board of Regents in 1980, and the development by the Board of the Long Range Plan under discussion, have broad national significance. We need to assume that federal funding of education will never again equal the generosity of the post-war decades. We need to remember that the American economy as a whole has never before faced the level of international competition that is taken for granted today. These strained conditions of uncertain finances and changing population trends have caused American education to go against its normal tide. We need to take account of the fact that national, regional and state-wide planning has never -- under peacetime conditions -- been an American forte. But Massachusetts is special. Even in an education-intensive region like New England, it stands out as a place where American higher education got its start and has flourished for more than three hundred years. In a most remarkable way, it is today identified with high technology as well as with the most ancient educational monuments our culture has to offer.

What that means is that the Long Range Plan under discussion will have a predictably intense impact on American educators and on those in government and industry with whom they must deal. And we can therefore assume that the effort now under way in Massachusetts will soon have its counterparts in most or all of the other states. In commenting on the Plan, therefore, I have made it my mission to be very scrupulous -- without descending to the level commonly known as "nit-picking." Its virtues and its shortcomings need to be acknowledged and distinguished if the rest of the country is to learn as much from it as needs to be learned at this difficult time in our history.

I have divided my comments into three sections. In the first of these, which is also the most uniformly appreciative, I have tried to conduct a fair paraphrase and appraisal of just what it is that Massachusetts proposes to do. In the second, I have tried to be as helpful as possible in pointing to an area that no Plan of this kind can take into account when it is first drawn up, i.e., the predictable human challenges implied by the process of putting the Plan into effect. In the third section of my commentary, I have tried to articulate what I regard as the Plan's most conspicuous weakness -- a weakness that threatens to undermine all of the efforts now being made to prepare higher education in this country for the conditions of the 1980's and the 1990's.

PART ONE: GOING AGAINST THE AMERICAN GRAIN

Our ecologists, our historians and our political scientists have reminded us, and are reminding us, of some of the enduring biases of our culture; and their efforts are being seconded by elected officials at every level from the White House to City Hall. America was born in the period not of Caesar or of Charlemagne but of Adam Smith. The concept of the marketplace, the faith in the "invisible hand," runs in our bloodstream and resides in our bone marrow. We generate such colossal energies because of our faith in individual effort or in the capacity of small groups to freely define their own destiny. And we usually have a concomitant distrust for, or active hostility toward, the vision of centralized planning and control which in much of Europe is simply taken for granted.

Against that background, the first four words of the title of the document we are discussing -- A Long Range Plan -- make a revolutionary impact on the reader. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in its collective wisdom, has decided to bring system and order into the management of all of its taxpayer-supported universities, four-year colleges, and community colleges.[1] It has thought its way past the phase of academic history in which what happened to a particular school was determined by the interaction between that school's faculty, president and trustees. It has thought its way into an altogether different vision in which what happens to the same school will be determined by the interaction between that school's faculty, that school's President, that school's trustees, the Board of Regents, the Chancellor who serves as the Regents' chief executive officer, the Massachusetts Legislature, and the Governor.

In place of three major parties, we now have seven. Their hierarchical relationship has been, on paper, carefully defined. At the top, in every sense of the word, is the 15 member Board of Regents. As noted on page 1 of the Plan, "No other state of comparable size and complexity in higher education has yet given this degree of central authority and responsibility for all postsecondary education in the public sector to a single governing board."

The Board relates in two directions: with "the executive and legislative branches of the government and the individual Boards of Trustees" (p. 4). The Board has already decided that "no new associate degrees will be approved for baccalaureate degree-granting institutions" (p.16). The Board will review, on an annual basis, the enrollment goals of each of the 27 taxpayer-supported institutions in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (p. 29). The Board is working with those responsible for primary and secondary education to see to it that by the end of the 1980's high school students will be prepared "with pre-collegiate skills before acceptance to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions" (p. 30).

---

1. To appreciate exactly how radical this is, see, for example, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching report entitled The Control of the Campus, issued October 1982.

Faculties and administrators throughout the Commonwealth will now have to learn to share the responsibility for academic planning not only with their own Boards of Trustees but with the state-wide Board of Regents (p. 49). Lest there by any misunderstanding as to what "sharing" implies in this context, the Long Range Plan states: "The Board of Regents has the responsibility to determine what the higher education needs of the state are, both in terms of manpower and in terms of its individual citizens. They must also decide how resources can best be utilized to meet these needs" (p. 50). And: "State-wide planning is carried out by the Board of Regents" (p. 51).

Moreover, "The Board of Regents should adopt a catalytic role in promoting cooperative efforts among public and private institutions" (p. 52). In addition to reviewing, on an annual basis, the enrollments of each of the 27 taxpayer-supported institutions, the Board will undertake periodic system-wide reviews of selected academic fields or program areas (p. 57). The Board will undertake comprehensive institutional program reviews on a 5-year cycle that is already under way (p.62).

Pulled together in this abbreviated way, the mandate of the Board of Regents has a sweep and power that, against the background of previous decades in higher education, can only be described as awesome. The only appropriate historical parallel may be the moment when the fiefdoms of the Middle Ages definitively faded away and the centralized monarchy of a Louis XIV, complemented by an efficient nation-wide bureaucracy, put in its magnificent appearance.

At the same time, the Long Range Plan is careful to allot roles to the more traditional players on the academic stage. In addition to listening to the advice of its own Chancellor, who serves at its pleasure, the Board holds the individual Boards of Trustees and the Presidents of the various taxpayer-supported institutions "responsible, with appropriate reference to collective bargaining agreements, for cooperating with internal governance structures which are part of an age-old tradition in the academic world" (p. 2).

It is the Chancellor's responsibility to see to it that the deliberations between the faculty, Presidents and trustees are brought into reasonable mesh with the policy options that he or she subsequently presents to the Board -- so that the latter "have reasonable support."

Thus the genial and expensive chaos that has long characterized higher education in Massachusetts, as in other states, is to come to an end, and is to be replaced by a system which, though it makes no utopian claims, does aspire to an almost mathematical ideal of accountability. Sharp yeses or noes are to replace the blurred maybes that have long seemed a sine qua non of academic life. The government and citizens of Massachusetts are to be left in no doubt at all as to who is responsible for doing what. Those within the system who deviate from these guidelines will do so, presumably, at their own peril.

The title I have given to this portion of my remarks -- "Going Against the American Grain" -- has its share of irony. The fact is that attempts to get taxpayer-supported education under control can be seen in populist as well as monarchical terms. It may be that only the halcyon universe of 1950-1970 made it seem that Americans had undergone a sudden conversion to the cause of intellectual elitism. And historical retrospect may yet make it clear that the "counter-culture" rebels of the late sixties, in the hostility they showed toward the colleges and universities in which they were usually enrolled, were the lineal forerunners of Ronald Reagan and other current disciplinarians.

Historical retrospect may find, too, that the laissez-faire rhetoric of the current moment is less significant than the concerted efforts now being made by the states of the Union -- in areas that range from education to the tax policies applied to industry -- to assure their own fiscal survival and well-being. Deeper paradoxes than that one have certainly been a feature of world history.

I would like to leave open at this point, therefore, the question of whether or not this new system for higher education in Massachusetts will succeed, succeed only in part, or fail. That is a question that will be answered within a framework that goes far beyond even the Board's extensive purview. It will be more profitable, I think, if I address myself to the predictable stresses and strains that will occur as the new system goes into full operation.

PART TWO: MUTINY TAKES MANY FORMS

A system of rationalization and control as ambitious as that being undertaken by the Board of Regents should ideally coincide with the moment when taxpayer-supported institutions of higher education are first created. The second-best possibility is that the system be instituted when they first begin to fructify and multiply. Running a distant third is the possibility that they are put into effect when 27 colleges and universities are already in operation -- but when a large proportion of their faculties consist of young and untenured teachers who are maximally amenable to what the new system implies.

In reality, of course, the path being taken by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is the only one available. Centralization is being imposed at a time when aging, tenured faculties constitute one side of the academic equation, the other side of which consists of a distressing number of underpaid adjuncts who have no faculty status at all. To the extent that many of the former group have responded to the increasingly stringent conditions of the past decade, they have done so by adopting the values and the rhetoric of collective bargaining, and have mastered the fine art of digging in one's heels.

What this suggests to me is that the Long Range Plan, admirable as it is in its scope and vision, has omitted -- necessarily, perhaps -- the human obstacles that stand in the way of full implementation.

Let me make my point as sharp as possible by citing a single example. Of all the thorns in the side of today's college or university President, one of the sharpest is that represented by "faculty retraining." I doubt there is a President in this country who would not like to see his or her faculty members give wholehearted support to the idea that retraining is desirable (1) to stabilize the finances of the school; and (2) to assure that no able person, tenured or untenured, needs to be dismissed from the faculty because he or she cannot find students to teach. At the same time, the obstacles to such a retraining program are formidable. Retraining is easiest for those who are in their twenties or early thirties, while the tenured faculty with the worst enrollment problems are often in their forties and fifties. Moreover, those senior faculty members underwent their "socialization" as undergraduates and graduate students at precisely the time when academic ideology was most hostile to practice as opposed to theory, and to the idea that "the world outside" should have a voice in deciding what get taught "inside."

In reading through the Long Range Plan, however, I find that this perspective is most conspicuous by its complete absence. The section on "Faculty and Staff Development" (p. 10) contents itself with the succinct observation that "faculty and staff development and retraining will become

increasingly more important /sic/ in times of fixed staff levels and limited mobility. To make maximum use of existing faculty and staff, more flexibility in career roles is needed.

I repeat: This is only one example of the ways in which the Long Range Plan omits any discussion of what, from an administrator's point of view, is the vital perspective of implementation. Perhaps this omission will be made good in Phase Two of the Plan. I myself would have preferred to see it discussed sooner rather than later.

The question of implementation is closely allied to -- indeed, indistinguishable from -- the problem of morale. The fact is that even within a single college or university, administrators experience a kind of conundrum in connection with any attempt to introduce a change in policy. The mere fact that the change is being recommended by the administration tends to inspire faculty resistance because it calls attention to the fact that the faculty is not the only group capable of generating recommendations. From there it is only a short jump to the more embattled position that "the administration is trying to ram this down our throats and we need to stop them." There is usually at least one faculty activist willing to embrace this position and to proselytize actively on its behalf.

In my experience, this conundrum is experienced, within a single academic institution, even when the proposal being made is mild and arguably beneficial to faculty interests. Any suggested change, when it originates from outside the faculty of a particular school, galvanizes and intensifies the sense of "we-ness" that is otherwise merely latent in the group -- and this in turn can shade over rather quickly into the more dangerous sense of "it's us against them."

How much more delicate, therefore, is the project envisioned by the Long Range Plan, which is a mandatory alteration in the previous state of affairs imposed at a single moment in history on the faculties at 27 different campuses.

Let me make it quite clear what I am talking about. I am not talking about active "resistance" or an enormous "explosion" on the model of the 1960's. In an economically tight time, phenomena like that have become relatively rare. What I am talking about is a spectrum of feelings whose consequences emerge, pervasively, in something closer to "passive" resistance, which in turn is synonymous with system-wide demoralization. The results show themselves most obviously on the firing line: where instructors meet their students. Even today I often hear reports, from the departments in which underenrollment leads to depression and fears of job loss, that the feelings of the instructors are being communicated all too effectively to the students. The styles of communication may vary. Some instructors have the habit, alas, of taking 25 students at a time into their "confidence" and of telling them outright what an awful system presently prevails at this reprehensible and increasingly shabby

place. More commonly, the instructor's depression and demoralization communicates itself in sotto voce forms, through "body language" and an occasional sigh or involuntary groan.

Demoralization, anxiety and anger make themselves felt in other contexts as well, sometimes in very oblique ways. When faculty members feel themselves to be under stress, and come to share a perception that they are being treated unjustly or with less dignity than their position mandates, they are sometimes capable of acting those feelings out in the most unexpected and even self-hurtful contexts. Whatever the direction in which their emotions move, however, we should never lose sight of the special glee with which loud academic disputes are covered by the regional and nation-wide media -- or of the many ways in which the articulateness of college and university faculty members serves media needs and desires.

In other words, I feel that one of the most urgent needs of the Regents in implementing the Long Range Plan is to see to it that the rather stringent and sometimes military tone of the Plan does not lead to an unanticipated long-range effect: system-wide hostility to the Plan itself and a broadly based determination, by faculty and staff at some or most of the 27 schools involved, to sabotage it wherever possible. Let us not forget that the root of the word sabotage itself suggests the quiet and infinitely diversified ways in which those inside any system can effectively gum up the works!

Side by side with the "topside" efforts the Regents are making there must be, in other words, an accompanying support effort whose emphasis is on caring about people and communicating concern to them in ways that they can appreciate. The Regents must now allow themselves to be lured into the classic error of the general -- or the President of the United States -- who assumes that orders are being carried out because they are being carried away from his desk and because his aides assure him that everything is being taken care of. The Regents, to adopt some currently fashionable terminology, need a "feed-back loop" which tells them, as accurately as possible, what is going on at each of the campuses under their jurisdiction. And "what is going on" means the current situation in terms of morale and/or malaise as well as of formal compliance with the Long Range Plan.

It may be that such a "feedback loop" will have to be quite elaborately devised. Neutral parties may have to be drawn from independent universities located in states other than Massachusetts. The only thing about which I am completely certain is that the Plan is naive when it omits this issue entirely from the subjects under consideration.

I myself would be neither falsely optimistic nor exaggeratedly gloomy about the prospects for the Plan's success. I would only note that when something truly unprecedented is being tried, it is wise to leave no stone unturned in the effort to make it succeed. Success, when and if it comes, will be the result of a full and active involvement of the intelligence and energies of all concerned: those who propose the Plan; those who implement it; and those who, by and large, do what they are told.

PART THREE: IF IT'S A REVOLUTION, WHY IS THERE STILL DUST ON THE SILL?

My comments up to this point have emphasized two major points: (1) that the project envisioned by the Long Range Plan is very ambitious, and (2) that its ambitiousness poses certain obstacles to its success.

But ambitiousness, as we all know, is a highly relative quality, and the task that engrosses a hundred thousand ants cannot, in the short run, compete in scope with that carried out by a single crane or bulldozer. The Long Range Plan is ambitious -- even revolutionary -- by the standard of the prevailing level of ambitiousness in American higher education. This leaves unanswered the question of whether it is adequate in meeting the challenges posed by the period in which we happen to live.

As my text in seeking to answer this question, I would like to assemble several quotations from the Long Range Plan:

(1) "The Board of Regents should adopt a catalytic role in promoting cooperative efforts among public and private institutions. Legislation similar to that proposed by the Illinois Board of Higher Education should be recommended to the Massachusetts Legislature... Funds in support of joint program development and operation could be provided in such areas as library computer systems, educational television, etc." (p. 52)

(2) "In order to assure access to a broad spectrum of education programs, especially those which have a limited clientele or are exceptionally costly to duplicate, institutional mission and program statements /of taxpayer-supported colleges and universities in Massachusetts/ will be coordinated on a regional and state-wide basis." (p. 7)

(3) "The challenge for the Board of Regents is to maintain a comprehensive system of public higher education. In order to fulfill this mandate, cooperative academic planning must occur. The planning effort should involve both public and private institutions. The Board of Regents, however, has limited authority over some institutions and none over others. Therefore, the Regents invite private institutions to participate both in program planning and review of existing programs on a voluntary basis so that coherent planning for higher education in the Commonwealth can occur." (p. 50)

To these quotations I would like to add a single salient phrase from page 1 of an as-yet-uncirculated report by David L. Rumpf of the Board of Regents, "Financing Public Higher Education -- Comparative Study":

(4) "...Massachusetts has over 50% of its higher education enrollment in the private sector..."

What I would like to suggest to you is that these four quotations, taken together, constitute a program for quiet despair, and do so all the more effectively because the Long Range Plan presents itself as an antidote to despair. In a state notable for the high percentage of students enrolled in independent institutions of higher education, a comprehensive state-wide planning effort aimed at rationalizing the relationships between colleges and universities is going to invite the participation in the planning process of such independent colleges and universities as see fit to respond to the invitation!

In a time of tight money and scarce resources, an act of the Massachusetts Legislature will provide funds that can be used to encourage taxpayer-supported and independent schools to cooperate in three absolutely crucial areas: library computer systems, educational television, and, of course, "etc."

The thinking here seems to me exaggeratedly timid. And I feel that it is the duty of the Board of Regents of no less a state than Massachusetts to help us to find our way past the cliché-ridden, conflict-accepting categories that threaten taxpayer-supported and independent schools in every state of the Union.

To make my point absolutely clear, I would like to strip my own thinking down to a number of grass-roots axioms, and then build my argument up toward what I hope will be seen as an inevitable conclusion.

AXIOM NUMBER ONE: Higher education in the United States has only begun to feel the full challenges of the closing decades of the twentieth century.

The fact is that those challenges are not limited to the inflation and rising costs of which we have heard so much since the early seventies. Educators in taxpayer-supported and independent institutions are going to have to learn to pay careful attention to a theme now being emphasized in every major newspaper and in the other media as well: America's industrial infrastructure -- its roads, highways, tunnels, sewer systems and bridges -- is falling apart. Deferred maintenance has reached the point where it can no longer be deferred. The resulting risks to life, limb, property and commerce will cost untold billions -- tens of billions and hundreds of billions -- of dollars that can only be provided through government appropriations, financed, if need be, by public borrowing.

This is a harrowing truth. It means that higher education will have to stand in line with agencies whose purpose it is to keep school buses from tumbling into canyons and pregnant women from contracting typhoid fever. What that translates into, as far as I can see, is cutbacks for higher education on a scale that will make the late seventies and early eighties look, in retrospect, like an all-expenses-paid vacation.

Nor does this harrowing truth altogether exhaust the list of new constituencies that will be competing with higher education for government, corporate, foundation, and individual philanthropic help. I am presently serving as

chairman of a Distinguished Citizens Task Force on Quality Teaching in the state of Connecticut. It has helped to make me aware of a new nation-wide concern -- reflected in the Long Range Plan itself -- with primary and secondary education. It seems that we are finally in the process of looking into the state of affairs that pays a high school teacher of science or mathematics a grand total of $13,000. for working five days a week helping the United States to stay abreast of its industrial competitors in Western Europe and the Far East. The outcome of that nation-wide concern will undoubtedly cost a lot of money -- and that money will have to come from the same sources that help to finance both sectors of higher education.

Finally, let us not lose sight of the fact that our population is aging, and that older people simply do not have the passion for education -- at any level from kindergarten to graduate school -- of their juniors, especially not when they worry about fuel bills and the survival of Social Security. They will vote down the school funding bills that depend on their vote, and the resulting deficits will have to be made up, at some point, out of money that might have gone to higher education.

This is a grim picture, I'm sorry to say, and it leads me to

AXIOM NUMBER TWO: The distinction between most taxpayer-supported and most independent colleges and universities is not as sharp as it once was.

The reader of this commentary cannot have failed to notice that my personal wording differs, in certain basic respects, from that of the Long Range Plan. Wherever the Plan refers to "public" colleges and universities, I use the adjective taxpayer-supported. Wherever the Plan speaks of "private" institutions of higher education, I refer instead to independent schools.

This is more than mere crankiness on my part. The fact is that even my Axiom Number Two is inaccurate, given the fact that, as we all know, the independent institutions are in fact taxpayer-supported in a number of crucial respects. Much of the support that still comes out of Washington ends up in independent pockets (just as "public" institutions have taken to raising significant funds from "private" sources).

But this is only the beginning in seeing to it that we shift our perspective to seek non-intrusive ways that may help both categories of schools husband resources. By recognizing that they can't do everything and thus limiting their endeavors, they may survive to serve in their respective ways. I would prefer to begin with the big picture and to observe that we have a nation-wide problem ahead of us: to maintain access to quality higher education for those of our citizens who can benefit from it, and whom higher education will enable to benefit our nation and its economy. In this case, the need for "self-fulfillment," the need not to function at a level below one's talents and capacities, meshes perfectly with the need to have a trained labor force capable of competing with those being educated in other parts of the world.

It is possible to respond to the growing limitations on access with passive hand-wringing, or to see them as a challenge that points us in directions suggested by the Long Range Plan. I am a skeptic about central planning. I anticipate both philosophical and practical arguments against it. Yet I reluctantly conclude that the prohibitive social costs of redundancy oblige us to make a good-faith effort at long-range planning on a state-wide scale. We need it more or less in every one of the fifty states. And we need it in a form that gets away from the outmoded distinctions between taxpayer-supported and independent institutions (while retaining those distinctions which remain properly current and protect institutional integrity) because nothing less than that is capable of dealing with the full extent of the problem. All of the colleges and universities in the state are state institutions. And all of them educate "the public." All must step up to the needs of their communities, avoiding unnecessary duplication of programs. Faculty and institutional initiatives can be liberated by effective resource allocation.

Let me make several perfectly obvious statements. Independent colleges and universities are non-profit institutions struggling to see to it that they continue to serve students from families with every income level from high to middle to moderate to low. Taxpayer-supported colleges and universities are non-profit institutions struggling to see to it that they do not shut out students in such a way (1) that the local, state, regional and national well-being is adversely affected, and (2) that the taxpaying public becomes even more averse to subsidizing them at the levels they need to survive in reasonably decent shape.

Both taxpayer-supported and independent, non-profit institutions are "public" in the sense of serving the people and of being legally prohibited from lining the pockets of their administrators, teachers or trustees. They have more in common, today, than might have seemed conceivable as recently as three decades ago. Like flying buttresses, they need each other very badly. Above all, they need each other within the context of state-wide educational ecosystems that ultimately enable them all to survive in their own way. Working together, they can balance integrity and accountability. Cooperation, not competition, is the watchword of the decade ahead for higher education if it is to retain the trust and confidence of the American people who, after all, support both sectors.

Though I wish it weren't necessary to do so, I think it is advisable to state one more truism. The prevalence of paper in our lives -- the fact that even a Long Range Plan has to be reduced, ultimately, to that abstract form -- makes it possible for us to commit the absurdity of saying things like: "The college had to close down." Or: "Quite a few universities may have to be phased out."

Absurdities like that, as they trip off the typewriter, tend to obscure the fact that a full-grown college or university is an exceedingly complex organism which has developed over time -- usually quite a considerable length of time, if one includes the "planning process" -- and which will not be replaced, once it has been phased out, without the kinds of effort and

expense that might have made it advisable to leave it in existence. We have a remarkable system of higher education in this country which suits our special national needs: those of an extremely diversified, non-homogeneous population which includes many subcultures and large numbers of immigrants. That we are still able to hold our own at all with nations that are tighter, leaner, and in many ways more efficient can be attributed at least in part to the unique independent and taxpayer-supported "mix" that is the most conspicuous aspect of our system of higher education: a "mix" of government institutions and quasi-sovereign institutions that is almost impossible to explain to those who live abroad and have never experienced it at first hand.

In other words, we have something precious that is presently in existence and that must be preserved if we are not to suffer serious national consequences. State-wide planning systems that are genuinely comprehensive (yet flexible enough to insure informed institutional self-determination and possibly even campus-based program reviews) and founded on enlightened self-interest are one step that must be taken: Groups like the Board of Regents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts must learn to be less despairing in their relationships with independent colleges and universities, and to frame their visions in ways that create positive incentives for those colleges and universities to join in the planning process. The opportunity for all to be engaged in identifying options and seeking alternatives is the key to mutual endeavor. But, as Frank Rhodes of Cornell University has said, "In the formulation of policy, the states must maintain a balance between freedom and accountability, with the ultimate goal being the enhancement of higher education." We must be cautious. Joint planning must not erode the autonomy of the independent sector, which undergirds the liberty and freedom of the taxpayer-supported sector and the other way about.

As we struggle to maintain access to quality higher education without regard to economic class, we are also going to have to rethink, from the ground up, the question of paying for higher education, and of developing a comprehensive payment policy that will make it possible for all of the institutions of higher education within a state to be cooperative with each other and effective as a result of that cooperation. We need more thoughtful ways for distributing limited resources between the two sectors of higher education in a manner that is both equitable to them and the publics they serve.

This leads me to

AXIOM NUMBER THREE: Price, called "tuition," must be related, at all colleges and universities, to cost.

A statement like that might have seemed subversive in the 1960's and dubious, still, in the 1970's. But once we have taken account of the climate in which we now live, and the pressures that will be intensifying so dramatically in the next few years, I believe that the same statement will appear

almost fashionably conservative. From a nation-wide perspective, we will be able to maintain access to colleges and universities for students from all socio-economic groups only (1) if the colleges and universities survive and are available for attendance, and (2) if they are protected from the cutbacks in government funding that will intensify in coming years and will seriously affect both those we are used to denoting as "taxpayer-supported" and those we are used to referring to as "independent."

Thus far I have been putting all of my statements in the positive mode, and so I hope they have seemed relatively painless. Now I must call your attention to one of the corollaries that flows from my Axiom Number Three, and that is that in order to protect higher education, needless "bargains" in higher education must be systematically eliminated, just as they have been eliminated in the world of energy costs and open-market loans.

By a needless "bargain" I mean a tuition price conspicuously below the ability of a student (or his or her family) to pay. Bargains of this kind are still commonplace in the world of taxpayer-supported education. Because they are so commonplace, they imperil (1) the long-term quality of many taxpayer-supported institutions, (2) the short- and long-term quality and survival of many independent institutions, and (3) the abilities of both taxpayer-supported and independent institutions to continue to admit the numbers of students -- rich, poor, and in-between -- needed by our nation if it is to remain competitive in today's world.

We are stuck, I fear, with an impression that runs contrary to the old American axiom that you don't get something for nothing: the impression that higher education ought to be a bargain. Genuinely fair educational planning requires, however, that the stabilizing force of the marketplace put in an appearance. That is necessary not only if potential students are to have sufficient colleges and universities available to which they can go, but also if the offerings of those colleges and universities are to make any curricular, economic, and philosophical sense.

I can see a number of objections that may be made to what I have said in the preceding paragraphs. One of them is that any reference to the marketplace as a determining force in higher educaton -- even in the narrow area of pricing policies -- is (1) automatically destructive and/or (2) a capitulation to fashionable rhetoric now emanating from a number of political quarters.

It may help, therefore, if I observe that I am not a conservative Republican, but I do not assume that marketplace considerations are inherently inimical to the humanities, the social sciences, ethics and good morals. Even a most ardent Populist must admit that the pupils who followed Socrates had to trade off that particular pleasure for certain others that were available in the Athens of that time. Those who flocked to Abelard or to Luther also understood the principle that there are costs involved if one wants to reach a desired educational end.

The marketplace, which has existed in various forms for at least ten or twelve thousand years, is a measure of value rather than a determination of content. Those seeking to attract capital must offer something for which others are willing to pay. Those proposing to spend capital must choose, obviously, between the available "goods." Satisfaction for both parties is the goal of a marketplace system.

Only the unique conditions of the postwar period enabled the citizens of the United States to lose sight of the fact that marketplace considerations are operative in the field of education as in other areas. Demand for higher education temporarily outran supply. Significant sums of money derived from taxation were therefore made available in order to expand the supply. But that which was created between 1945 and 1970, including tenure contracts with tens of thousands of instructors and specialized architecture, could not be easily withdrawn when demand reshaped itself in a number of ways. As a result, we now have a seriously dysfunctional system that is inadaptive to current demographic, economic and sociological conditions. That is why the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has created the Board of Regents and that is why marketplace considerations -- including appropriate pricing policies -- must be restored, and consciously applied, to protect and preserve both sectors of American higher education.

A second objection that I can foresee is the political one: the assertion that "people won't stand for it" and that any attempt by legislators to institute rational pricing policies within the world of taxpayer-supported higher education will provoke unendurable resistance on the part of citizens who have grown used to government largesse in this particular area.

Well: maybe yes, but maybe no. I myself am always suspicious of arguments based on the assumption that most people are cretins who don't understand that the money disbursed by the legislature comes out of taxpayer pockets. I also suspect that those from moderate- and middle income backgrounds may prove unusually responsive to the observation that they are in effect subsidizing the attendance at taxpayer-supported institutions of those from upper-income backgrounds who pay the same tuition -- and that this helps to account for the deteriorating physical plant, crowded classrooms, and generally negative conditions in which their own children are going to school.

In my own state of Connecticut, the media have been vying with each other in their efforts to do justice to the unhappy physical decline of the University of Connecticut, where laboratory animals die of pneumonia before they can be used in experiments and where one now-famous classroom has an indoor gutter and drainage system to control its leaking ceiling. In the face of this, a recent poll conducted by UConn itself of state residents found that 87 percent of those surveyed were willing to pay a higher tuition price if the quality of the University could be maintained.[2.]

2. See report of University of Connecticut Institute for Social Inquiry, Everett Carll Ladd, October 1982.

We are probably a little pessimistic about the intelligence of our citizens and their willingness to pay for quality in higher education as they pay for quality in real estate or clothing. And, of course, nothing that I have said above contradicts the idea that loans and other forms of financial aid must be made available to students from families whose incomes make it impossible for them to pay a marketplace price in order to attend the college or university which offers the academic program most suitable to their needs. Even as we see to it that those who can pay for their higher education do so -- at rates reflecting the costs of that education -- we must establish sensible and responsible ways to accommodate those who need financial aid in order to be educated. Quality, access, and choice are the three pillars of this thesis.

Only the unique conditions of postwar America made it possible to conceive of higher education as something into which one drifted like a cork on the tide. The very existence of the Board of Regents testifies to the fact that that period is coming to an end -- as, indeed, do many of the specific policies described in the Long Range Plan. Now we must go even further if we are to assure a decent future for all of our colleges and universities, for those who wish to attend them, and for the society -- the culture and the economy -- that they help to support.

CONCLUSION

I may appear to have moved some considerable distance beyond the subject under discussion, which is the Long Range Plan of the Board of Regents. But I have actually come full circle to the remarks with which I began. What the Board of Regents is doing is something very important, in a uniquely important state: It is recognizing our mutual dependencies and independencies, our need for joint enterprise and self-expression. If the Long Range Plan succeeds, and if the greater part of the higher education system of Massachusetts is stabilized and rationalized in an effective and varied way, if incentives can be created for efficient resource allocation and regular evaluation of academic and administrative effectiveness where those properly contribute to collective well-being, that will be good for the nation as a whole.

While I am not generally optimistic that this plea will receive an immediate and sympathetic hearing, I am encouraged by the positive steps recently announced by Chancellor John B. Duff of the Massachusetts Board of Regents recommending a pilot "engineering collaborative" aimed at producing more engineering graduates for New England. The arrangement, which calls for $300,000. to fund sixty students who have completed two years in pre-engineering at the University of Massachusetts so they may transfer to engineering programs at four independent universities in the Boston area (with the cost of their engineering education subsidized by tax funds), gives us reason to believe that there could be a light at the end of the tunnel.

To be successful, I believe, the Plan will have to have a somewhat longer range than it does at present. Let us hope that it is not too late to build this longer range into so admirable and so urgent an effort.

Comment on the Paper of Stephen Trachtenberg
by Dr. T. Edward Hollander

The Board of Regents Statewide Plan for Higher Education states clearly the key goals and policies of the Regents for public higher education. The next steps are most crucial -- the transformation of the policy goals into a strategic plan that documents which students should be served in the public sector, how they should be distributed among the institutions and tuition and tuition-aid strategies to assure equity and access. Lacking also is a strategic plan for financing, one that considers the unique size and strength of private higher education in the Commonwealth. Two fundamental issues need to be explored further:

-- how will higher education meet its financial needs or adjust to available resources?

-- how will quality be maintained in the face of declining resources, expanding needs, declining high school preparation and low growth?

A fundamental flaw in the Commonwealth system is the absence of a neutral board that can coordinate the roles and financing of public and private higher education as the state seeks to preserve the strength of both systems. Such role is impossible and undesirable for a Board with governance responsibilities for public higher education.

Comment on the Paper of Stephen Trachtenberg
by Dr. John B. Duff

In his paper on the Board of Regents' Long Range Plan, President Trachtenberg has attempted, in his words, 'to conduct a fair paraphrase and appraisal of just what it is that Massachusetts proposes to do." I believe that he has accomplished a fair paraphrase of Phase I of the Long Range Plan as well as a brief analysis of the legislation which created the Board of Regents. His analysis has been overtaken, however, by the history of the past two years since the Board of Regents came into existence.

President Trachtenberg comments with something approaching awe on the power of the Board of Regents. He states,

> the mandate of the Board of Regents has a sweep and power that, against the background of previous decades in higher education, can only be described as awesome. The only appropriate historical parallel may be the moment when the fiefdoms of the Middle Ages definitively faded away and the centralized monarchy of Louis XIV, complemented by an efficient nation-wide bureaucracy, put in its magnificent appearance.

This is an arresting analogy. Someone in my office remarked that if that were the case the Chancellor could say, in the style of Louis XIV, "L'etat c'est moi." To that I can only reply that Louis XIV's successor was forced to comment ruefully and prophetically, "Apres moi le deluge."

President Trachtenberg is concerned with the governing authority vested in the Board of Regents. This development cannot be understood without comprehending the previous Massachusetts history of ineffectual, overlapping, and competing governing boards which had lost the respect of the executive branch, the legislature and institutions alike.

The Board of Regents has taken some extremely important actions concerning the governance process in Massachusetts public higher education. First of all I cite the central role played by local boards of trustees in the day-to-day management and oversight of the 27 public institutions which, through delegation of authority by the Regents, now enjoy far more control over collective bargaining and personnel than they had prior to the reorganization.

Nor can we overlook the extremely important consultative role played by the Council of Public College Presidents in advising the Chancellor of Higher Education and, through him, influencing the policy of the Regents. The most significant example of a cooperative effort between the institutions

and the Regents was the collaborative effort to develop a unitary higher education budget. For the first time in the history of the Commonwealth, all the institutions have agreed both on the process of allocation of funds and on the amounts recommended to the specific institutions.

President Trachtenberg's analysis is complimentary of the Long Range Plan in many ways, using such words as "exciting" and "revolutionary" and predicting the plan will have a long range effect on higher education in the United States. But he expresses concern about the question of maintenance and improvement of quality at our public institutions. The truth is that the central thrust of most of the fifty planning directives contained in the Long Range Plan is to maintain and improve quality at all the public institutions. Most specifically, the plan proposes minimum admissions standards and statewide program review procedures.

The second part of the speaker's remarks address what he calls "the predictable human challenges implied by the process of putting (the plan) into effect." He enumerates the resistance of tenured faculty to retraining, and an academic ideology which is hostile to the idea that "the world outside" should have a voice in deciding what is taught "inside." These, of course, are legitimate concerns; such attitudes constrain all institutions of higher learning today.

President Trachtenberg has very astutely pointed to the major problem of implementation of the plan: the necessity of cooperation, particularly faculty cooperation, to achieve the desired goals. This is the key to success -- to develop specific institutional goals, within the context of the Long Range Plan, that are the product of local institutional cooperative planning. This plan will have involved all segments of the institutional community; only with their support shall progress toward the desired goals be accomplished.

The final part of the speaker's remarks are probably the most important from the perspective of the Alden Seminar and its focus on public/private sector issues. Let me begin by stating the obvious:

(1) Phase I of the Regent's Plan is intended to establish a policy framework for <u>public</u> higher education;

(2) Early in the planning process it was evident that substantial dialogue with the independent sector could not take place until we had our "house in order;"

(3) We are now in the process of trying to re-establish a public/private forum through the efforts of a joint task force of public and private presidents established in conjunction with AICUM. From the Task Force we expect specific recommendations to strengthen both our public and private educational resources, which we cannot afford to squander.

In the last section of his paper, President Trachtenberg lists certain axioms. These axioms are significant because they delineate several major issues, although not in a way that is always consistent with my perception of these issues. His first axiom is: "Higher education in the United States has only begun to feel the full challenges of the closing decades of the twentieth century.

I think we can all agree that we face difficult times ahead because of a confluence of factors, including demographic declines, inflation, deferred maintenance now catching up with us and increased competition for fewer real dollars. From this I conclude we will need:

- a more effective use of resources, both public and private
- a more effective voice in the legislative process speaking for the value of a sustained and substantial investment in education
- an agreement on the rules of the game governing the inevitable reduction in scale of the higher education enterprise that will take place over the next 15 years
- an understanding of new demands that will be placed on our educational institutions due to a shifting clientele.

His second axiom is: "The distinction between most taxpayer-supported and most independent colleges and universities is not as sharp as it once was." I agree that both independent and public institutions serve a public purpose. Moreover, more things unite the public and independent sectors than divide them. Nonetheless, there are some fundamental differences which cannot be dismissed. An issue which needs some dispassionate discussion is whether increased state support of independent institutions should carry with it any increased responsibility to be responsive to perceived needs of the Commonwealth.

I note that President Trachtenberg cautions that "Joint planning must not erode the autonomy of the independent sector, which undergirds the liberty and freedom of the taxpayer-supported sector and the other way about." Yet if we are to have true planning and cooperation between the independent and private sectors, there must be some understanding that the plans must be adhered to. For example, if, through the planning process, it is agreed that only one geology program is needed in a given section of the state, will it be possible for the independent sector to live up to such a commitment? It certainly is possible for the public sector to do so.

We should all realize that if the federal government continues to reduce student aid and research support, such actions will have a serious impact on all higher education, particularly the independent sector. The extent to which and in what manner the state can and should fill the gap needs serious discussion; it is my hope that the Alden Seminar can continue to contribute to that process.

President Trachtenberg's third axiom is: "Price, called 'tuition,' must be related at all colleges and universities to cost." Most of us agree that there should be a relationship, fewer of us agree on precisely what that relationship should be. In the past five years students attending Massachusetts public institutions have been obliged to pay a larger share of the cost of their education. Currently those who can afford it are contributing approximately 25 percent of cost. In addition, student fees have risen substantially at public as well as private institutions. The Regents will evaluate future tuition policy options which must be both rational and equitable while assuring that no student shall be denied access on the basis of financial cost.

The Regents strongly support increases in the state scholarship program; we are developing a joint public/independent effort to expand engineering program opportunities in the Boston area. Consortia will be encouraged and assisted wherever possible.

Conclusion

Speaking of the thirteen colonies, Benjamin Franklin warned, "We must indeed all hang together, or most assuredly, we shall all hang separately." To put it in a more modern idiom, we are all in this together. Both public and independent institutions face severe economic and demographic problems and there is a growing necessity for cooperation. Reasonable people may differ on the details of that cooperative enterprise, but that does not mean we should abandon the search for compatible joint solutions. The Regents' Long Range Plan is primarily directed at the organization and goals of public higher education but that is because the public sector is our primary mandate. The educational needs of the Commonwealth as a whole necessitate a variety of cooperative enterprises. Cooperation will redound to the educational benefit of all of the citizens of this Commonwealth.

ALDEN SEMINARS

PARTICIPANTS

JAMES T. AMSLER

James T. Amsler is President of Salem State College. He has also served as President of North Adams State College and as Associate Director of the Division of Massachusetts State Colleges.

MORTIMER H. APPLEY

Mortimer H. Appley became President of Clark University in 1974. Prior to this appointment he served as Associate Provost and as Dean of Graduate Studies at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. He is Chairman of the Executive Committee of A.I.C.U.M.

JOHN E. BROOKS

John E. Brooks, S.J. is President of the College of the Holy Cross, where he previously served as Vice President and Academic Dean. A graduate of the College of the Holy Cross, he also attended Boston College and Gergorian University.

JOHN W. CHANDLER

John W. Chandler became President of Williams College in 1973. Prior to that he served as President of Hamilton College. He has served as Chairman of the Executive Committee of A.I.C.U.M. and as President of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

ROBERT A. CORRIGAN

Robert A. Corrigan has been Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts/Boston since 1979. Previously, he has been a Provost at the University of Maryland, and before that Dean of Arts and Sciences at the University of Missouri/Kansas City. A graduate of Brown University and the University of Pennsylvania, he has been a member of the faculty of Bryn Mawr College, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Iowa and the University of Gothenburg in Sweden.

ROBERT CUSHMAN

Robert Cushman is Chairman of the Board of the Norton Company where he served as President and Chief Executive Officer. A graduate of Dartmouth, he has served as an overseer of the Amos Tuck School of Business Administration, among his many civic and business activities. He presently serves on the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education.

JOHN M. FOX

John M. Fox is Chairman of the Board of SCA Services, Inc. A graduate of Colgate University, he has also served as President of H.P. Hood, United Brands, and the Minute Maid Corporation.

CARL GILBERT

Carl Gilbert is in his eighth year as President of A.I.C.U.M. After graduating from Harvard Law School he joined the firm now called Ropes and Gray. He then joined Gillette as Treasurer and then became President and Chief Executive Officer. He has been a trustee of Tufts University for many years.

AVRAM J. GOLDBERG

Avram J. Goldberg is President and Chief Executive Officer of the Stop and Shop Companies. He also serves as an associate Trustee of Boston College, as a Fellow of The American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and as a member of the Corporation of the Boston Museum of Science. He is a Director of the Executive Board of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.

GEORGE W. HAZZARD

George W. Hazzard is President Emeritus of Worcester Polytechnic Institute. He has also served on the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education and is a Director of Project QUILL (Quality in Liberal Learning) and Project MAP (Minority Achievement Program) for the Association of American Colleges.

JOSEPH P. HEALEY

Joseph P. Healey, counsel to the law firm of Nasson and Hoban, served as President and Chairman of the Board of Bay Bank Middlesex. He has also served as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts and as a member of the faculty at Boston College Law School.

JACOB HIATT

Jacob Hiatt, President of Rand-Whitney Corporation, is a graduate of the University of Lithuania and Clark University. He serves as a Trustee of Brandeis University, of the College of the Holy Cross, of the Tri-College Board, and as a Life Trustee of Clark University.

ELIZABETH KENNAN

Elizabeth Kennan has served as President of Mount Holyoke College since 1978. Before that she served as an Associate Professor of History at Catholic University of America where she was Director of the Medieval and Byzantine Studies Program. She serves on the Council on Foreign Relations and is Chairman of the Commission on Government Relations of the American Council on Education.

DAVID C. KNAPP

David C. Knapp has been the President of the University of Massachusetts system since 1978. Prior to that he served as Provost of Cornell University. He has also served as Dean of the New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell and as Director of the Institute of College and University Administrators of the American Council on Education.

RODERICK M. MACDOUGALL

Roderick M. MacDougall serves as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Bank of New England Corporation and the Bank of New England. A graduate of Harvard, his educational activities include service as a trustee of Northeastern, member of the Corporation of Babson, and former President of Tri-Lateral Council for Quality Education.

DOROTHY MARSHALL

Dorothy Marshall is a Commonwealth Professor emeritus at U/Mass Boston. Her academic fields of interest are Political Science-Latin America, and Spanish. She is a former trustee of Holy Cross College, a former trustee and Chairman of the Board of Smith College, currently serves as trustee of Bryn Mawr College, Neworld Savings Bank, the Ford Foundation, Pan American Society of New England and Northfield/Mt. Herman School.

HAROLD T. MILLER

Harold T. Miller is Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Houghton Mifflin Company, a Boston-based publishing firm. He is a trustee of Franklin and Marshall College and Babson College, and a council member of the American Antiquarian Society. Mr. Miller is also a director of the New England Merchants National Bank and its holding company, New England Merchants Company, Inc., and SCA Services, Inc.

COLEMAN M. MOCKLER, JR.

Mr. Mockler is Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Gillette Company. He is also a director of First National Boston Corporation, the First National Bank of Boston, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, Raytheon Company and Fabreeka Products Company, as well as Chairman of the Corporation of Simmons College.

GUY W. NICHOLS

Guy W. Nichols is Chairman, President, and Chief Executive Officer of the New England Electric System. A graduate of the University of Vermont, he has an M.S. in Business Administration from W.P.I. He is a Trustee of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

-30-

FRANKLIN PATTERSON

Franklin Patterson is the Director of the Center for Policy Studies and Boyden Professor of the University at U/Mass-Boston. A political scientist, he has taught at NYU, Tufts, Hampshire, and the University of Massachusetts. He directed the Lincoln Filene Center at Tufts, was the founding President of Hampshire 1966-71, and Board Chairman there 1971-74, and has served several educational institutions as trustee. A former secretary of the University of Massachusetts, he was interim president of that institution in 1978.

DAVID B. PERINI

David B. Perini is Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of Perini Corporation. He is a graduate of Holy Cross College and Boston College Law School. He serves as a Trustee of Holy Cross and is a member of the Boards of State Street Boston Corporation, the Boston Council, Boy Scouts of America, and a corporator of New England Deaconess Hospital and Wentworth Institute of Technology.

EDWARD E. PHILLIPS

Edward E. Phillips, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company, is a graduate of Amherst College and Harvard Law School. He is a Trustee of Amherst College, the New England Aquarium and The New England Conservatory. He has also served on the State Board of Education.

KENNETH G. RYDER

Kenneth G. Ryder is the fourth President of Northeastern University. Prior to his election as President he served as Executive Vice-President. A graduate of Boston University, he has served as Chairman of the Executive Committee of A.I.C.U.M., as a member of the National Commission on Student Financial Assistance, as President of the National Committee of Urban Program Universities, and as Vice-Chairman of the National Commission for Cooperative Education.

HAROLD E. SHIVELY

Harold E. Shively is a founding President of Bunker Hill Community College in Boston, Massachusetts. He was also the founding President of North Shore Community College in Beverly, Massachusetts. An educational consultant, President Shively has worked with governments of many countries including Argentina, Venezuela, Israel, England, Surinam and Jamaica. He is Vice President of the Community Colleges Cooperative for International Development, Inc.

FRANK A. TREDINNICK, JR.

Frank A. Tredinnick, Jr., Executive Director of A.I.C.U.M., is in his 28th year as a teacher or administrator in higher education. His many posts have included service as a Vice President of Simmons College, Vice President of Tufts University, and as the first Director of the New England College Fund. He also headed the Regional Accrediting Association and the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

GUEST AUTHOR

STEPHEN J. TRACHTENBERG

Stephen J. Trachtenberg has served as President of the University of Hartford since 1977. Prior to that appointment he served as Vice President for Academic Services at Boston University. A graduate of Columbia University, he earned his J.D. at Yale University and his Masters in Public Administration at Harvard University. He has also served as a special assistant to the U.S. education commissioner and as a legislative assistant to a congressman.

GUEST COMMENTATORS

JOHN B. DUFF

John B. Duff has served as Chancellor of Higher Education for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts since 1981. Prior to this appointment he served as President of the University of Lowell and as Provost and Academic Vice President of Seton Hall University.

T. EDWARD HOLLANDER

T. Edward Hollander has served as Chancellor of the New Jersey Department of Higher Education since 1977. Prior to this appointment he served as Deputy Commissioner of Higher Education for the state of New York.